

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KARI ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

C&J WELL SERVICES, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-00150-KES-CDB

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE STIPULATED  
PROTECTIVE ORDER

(Doc. 11)

On June 16, 2025, the parties filed a proposed stipulated protective order. (Doc. 11). As discussed in more detail below, the undersigned is authorized to enter protective orders (Local Rule 302(1)) provided they comply with Local Rule 141.1. The Court has reviewed the proposed stipulated protective order and concludes it does not comply with Local Rule 141.1. For the reasons set forth below, the Court will deny without prejudice the parties' request to enter the proposed, stipulated protective order.

**The Stipulated Protective Order Fails to Comply with Local Rule 141.1(c)**

The proposed stipulated protective order does not comply with Local Rule 141.1. Pursuant to Rule 141.1(c), any proposed protective order submitted by the parties must contain the following provisions:

- (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the

1                   nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a  
2                   troubled child);

3                   (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of  
4                   information proposed to be covered by the order; and

5                   (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court  
6                   order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.

7                   Local Rule 141.1(c) (emphasis added).

8                   Here, the proposed protective order does not set forth an adequate description of the types  
9                   of information eligible for protection. In particular, the protective order's mere reference to  
10                  “confidential, proprietary, or private information” (Doc. 11 at 2) is not “sufficient to reveal the  
11                  nature of the information” sought to be protected. Nor does the protective order offer any  
12                  explanation as to what particularized need for protection is required, nor does the protective order  
13                  set forth why the need for protection should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private  
14                  agreement between or among the parties.

15                  **Conclusion and Order**

16                  Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' request for approval of the  
17                  proposed stipulated protective order (Doc. 11) is DENIED without prejudice. The parties may re-  
18                  file a revised, stipulated protective order that complies with Local Rule 141.1(c) and remedies the  
19                  deficiencies set forth in this order.

20                  IT IS SO ORDERED.

21                  Dated: June 17, 2025

22                    
23                  \_\_\_\_\_  
24                  UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE